

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed June 18, 2007, claims 1 – 35 were rejected. In response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, 11, 14, 15, 19, 23, 26 – 28, and 32 and canceled claims 5 – 7 and 24 – 25. Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the claim amendments and the below-provided remarks.

Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1 – 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, claims 1, 19, 23, 25 and 27 are rejected as being indefinite. Claims 1, 19, 23, and 27 have been amended. The amendments to claims 1 and 23 are described in more detail below. Claim 19 is amended to recite “*two delay devices having mutually different numbers of inverters*” and claim 27 has been amended to be dependent upon claim 26. In view of the amendments, Applicant asserts that claims 1, 19, 23, and 27 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1 – 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Dvorak et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,522,210, hereinafter Dvorak). However, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable over Dvorak for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 5 and to particularly point out that the oscillators are “free-running oscillators” when the respective feedback loops are closed. As amended, claim 1 recites:

“A random number generator comprising:
a pair of oscillators comprising a pair of inverters, each of the pair of oscillators having a feedback loop which when closed causes the respective oscillator to be an independent free-running oscillator;
at least one delay device connected in the feedback loop between an output and input of at least one of the pair of oscillators; wherein an input

signal of one oscillator is connectable to an output of another oscillator of said pair of oscillators;

a pair of cross gate switches, each of which respectively connects an input of one oscillator to an output of another oscillator.” (emphasis added)

Applicant asserts that claim 1 is not anticipated by Dvorak because Dvorak does not disclose “a pair of cross gate switches, each of which respectively connects an input of one oscillator to an output of another oscillator” as recited in amended claim 1. The Office action does not specifically address claim 5, as filed, and therefore does not specifically identify where Dvorak discloses the cross gate switches. Further, Applicant asserts that Dvorak does not disclose “a pair of cross gate switches, each of which respectively connects an input of one oscillator to an output of another oscillator” as recited in amended claim 1.

Independent Claim 23

Independent claim 23 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 24 and 25 and to point out that the oscillators form independent free-running oscillators when the respective outputs are fed back to the respective inputs. Applicant respectfully asserts independent claim 23 is patentable over Dvorak at least for similar reasons to those stated above in regard to the rejection of independent claim 1. In particular, claim 23 recites “connecting a pair of cross gate switches, each of which respectively connects an input of one inverter to an output of another inverter of said pair of inverters.” Here, although the language of claim 23 differs from the language of claim 1 and the scope of claim 23 should be interpreted independently of claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks provided above in regard to claim the rejection of 1 also apply to claim 23. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 23 is not anticipated by Dvorak.

Dependent Claims 2 – 4, 8 – 10, 12 – 22, and 26 – 35

Claims 2 – 4, 8 – 10, and 12 – 22 depend from claim 1 and claims 26 – 35 depend from claim 23. Applicant respectfully asserts these dependent claims are allowable at least based on allowable base claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the claim amendments and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-3444** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-3444** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: September 17, 2007

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111